

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Robert Steve Burgess a/k/a Steven Robert  
Burgess a/k/a Steve Robert Burgess,  
Plaintiff,

C.A. No.: 9:09-cv-01884-RBH

vs.

**ORDER**

Deborah Zeigt, Deputy Timothy Brown,  
Deputy NFN Howard, Corr. Officer NFN  
Wilkins, Sonya Moss, GCDC Head  
Supervisor Nurse, and James Doriety,  
Admin. Asst. Director GCDC,  
Defendants.

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, brought this suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment is granted and this case is dismissed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
April 20, 2010

---

<sup>1</sup> The court notes that the copy of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation that the court mailed to Plaintiff was returned as undeliverable. *See* [Docket Entry 56]. The envelope stated that Plaintiff was “released.” *Id.* The court had specifically ordered Plaintiff to keep the court advised “in writing” of any address changes, [Docket Entry 6] at 3, and Plaintiff has apparently failed to do so.